

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA- EASTERN DIVISION
12
13
14

15 ROLANDO VELA,) ED CV: 08-0948-SH
16)
17 Plaintiff,) MEMORANDUM DECISION
18)
19 v.)
20 MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,)
21 Commissioner of Social Security)
22 Administration,)
23 Defendant.)
24
25
26
27
28

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

I. PROCEEDINGS

This matter is before the Court to review the Administrative Law Judge's ("ALJ") denial of Plaintiff's application for Disability Insurance Benefits ("DIB") benefits. Plaintiff and Defendant have filed their respective pleadings and the parties have filed a Joint Stipulation dated February 25, 2009. The parties have consented to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Judge.

II. BACKGROUND

Plaintiff filed an application for DIB benefits on October 1, 2003, alleging disability as the result of back problems since September 14, 2001. The ALJ determined that Plaintiff was disabled between September 24, 2001 and May 1, 2003, following disectomy and nucleoplasty surgery on August 26, 2002 and a spinal fusion on April 3, 2003. On May 10, 2003, Plaintiff applied for a continuation of his disability benefits, however his application was denied. Plaintiff's application was reconsidered and again denied on November 20, 2003. Plaintiff filed a timely Request for Hearing on January 20, 2004 and a hearing was held before ALJ John W. Belcher on November 18, 2004. ALJ Belcher denied Plaintiff's DIB application on February 18, 2005. Plaintiff filed a Request for Review of ALJ Belcher's decision, which the Appeals Council denied on October 14, 2005. Plaintiff filed a Complaint with this court, which remanded the case for further proceedings on November 17, 2006. A new hearing was held before ALJ Joseph D. Schloss on November 8, 2007. The ALJ issued an opinion on February 6, 2008, holding that Plaintiff was disabled only until May 1, 2003. Plaintiff appealed from the Commissioner's denial of disability benefits, and filed a new Complaint in this Court on July 15, 2008.

III. DISCUSSION

Under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), this court reviews the Commissioner's decision to determine if: (1) the Commissioner's findings are supported by substantial evidence; and (2) the Commissioner used proper legal standards. DeLorme v. Sullivan, 924 F.2d 841, 846 (9th Cir. 1991). Substantial evidence means "more than a mere scintilla," Richardson v. Perales, 402 U.S. 389, 401 (1971), but "less than a preponderance." Desrosiers v. Secretary of Health & Human Servs., 846 F.2d 59, 60 (9th Cir. 1973), cert denied., Torske v. Weinberger, 417 U.S. 933 (1974); Harvey v. Richardson, 451 F.2d 589, 590 (9th Cir. 1971).

1 It is the duty of this court to review the record as a whole and to consider
2 adverse as well as supporting evidence. Green v. Heckler, 803 F. 2d 528, 529-30
3 (9th Cir. 1986). The court is required to uphold the decision of the Commissioner
4 where evidence is susceptible of more than one rational interpretation. Gallant v.
5 Heckler, 753 F.2d 1450, 1453 (9th Cir. 1984). The court has the authority to
6 affirm, modify or reverse the Commissioner's decision "with or without remanding
7 the cause for rehearing." 42 U.S.C. § 405 (g). Remand is appropriate where
8 additional proceedings would remedy defects in the Commissioner's decision.
9 McAllister v. Sullivan, 888 F.2d 599, 603 (9th Cir. 1989).

10 The Commissioner has established a five-step sequential evaluation for
11 determining whether a person is disabled. First, it is determined whether the
12 person is engaged in "substantial gainful activity." If so, disability benefits are
13 denied. Second, if the person is not so engaged, it is determined if the person has a
14 medically severe impairment or combination of impairments. If the person does
15 not have a severe impairment or combination of impairments, benefits are denied.
16 Third, if the person has a severe impairment, it is determined whether the
17 impairment meets or equals one of a number of "listed impairments." If the
18 impairment meets or equals a "listed impairment," the person is conclusively
19 presumed disabled. Fourth, if the impairment does not meet or equal the "listed
20 impairments," it is determined whether the impairment prevents the person from
21 performing past relevant work. If the person can perform past relevant work,
22 benefits are denied. Fifth, if the person cannot perform past relevant work, the
23 burden shifts to the Commissioner to show that the person is able to perform other
24 kinds of work. 20 C.F.R. §404.1520 (1994); Bowen v. Yuckert, 482 U.S. 137,
25 140-2 (1987).

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 Issue 1: The Second ALJ fully and fairly developed the record by
2 considering all available medical evidence.

3 The ALJ has an independent “duty to fully and fairly develop the record to
4 assure that the claimant’s interests are considered.” Smolen v. Chater, 80 F.3d
5 1273, 1288 (9th Cir. 1996) (quoting Brown v. Heckler, 713 F.2d 441, 443 (9th Cir.
6 1983)). Where evidence is ambiguous, or the ALJ finds the record is inadequate
7 to allow for proper evidentiary evaluation, the ALJ has a duty to conduct an
8 appropriate inquiry. Tonapetyan v. Halter, 242 F.3d 1144, 1150 (9th Cir. 2001).

9 Plaintiff contends that the ALJ failed to fully and fairly develop the record
10 because he did not order an objective consultative exam of Plaintiff, and
11 disregarded the findings of Dr. Cazares, Plaintiff’s chiropractor, and the December
12 2004 findings of Dr. Platt, Plaintiff’s treating orthopedic surgeon. Defendant
13 argues that the ALJ’s denial of Plaintiff’s DIB claim was grounded on substantial
14 evidence, consisting of the December 2003 findings of Dr. Platt and the testimony
15 of a medical expert, Dr. Lyons. As such, Defendant contends that the ALJ’s duty
16 to conduct further inquiry was not triggered.

17 Plaintiff was found disabled between September 14, 2001 and May 1, 2003.
18 (AR 408). During this period, Plaintiff underwent discectomy/nucleoplasty
19 surgery on August 26, 2002, and a spinal fusion on April 3, 2003. Plaintiff’s
20 prognosis following his spinal fusion was good, particularly after the removal of
21 his PCA tube. Following Plaintiff’s initial post-operative prognosis, he was
22 examined by chiropractor Dr. Marco Cazares on September 24, 2003, and by
23 treating orthopedic surgeon, Dr. Arthur Platt, in December 2003. (AR 411).
24 Although Dr. Cazares found that Plaintiff was disabled, Dr. Platt’s December 2003
25 examination of Plaintiff found him “permanent and stationary” and able to perform
26 light work, consisting of standing or walking and minimum demands for physical
27 effort. (AR 321).

28 Since no treating or examining medical records exist post Plaintiff’s

1 December 2003 examination by Dr. Platt, both ALJs relied on the testimony of
2 non-examining and non-treating physician, Dr. James Lyons, to support the denial
3 of Plaintiff's DIB claim. Dr. Lyons testified that Plaintiff's disability ended on
4 May 1, 2003 when his PCA tube was removed, which is supported by Dr. Platt's
5 subsequent finding that Plaintiff was not disabled. As such, Dr. Lyons' testimony
6 amounts to substantial evidence since the findings of non-treating and non-
7 examining physicians are given such weight when supported by other evidence in
8 the record. Andrews v. Shalala, 53 F.3d 1035, 1041 (9th Cir. 1995).

9 Although Dr. Cazares found Plaintiff disabled in September of 2003,
10 contradicting Dr. Lyons' testimony, a chiropractor's medical opinion is not
11 afforded substantial weight. 20 C.F.R. §404.1513 (a) (2008). This is especially
12 true since Dr. Cazares' finding of disability was also contradicted by Dr. Platt's
13 December 2003 examination of Plaintiff, which stated that Plaintiff was able to
14 perform light work. Because Dr. Platt was Plaintiff's treating physician, this
15 opinion is afforded substantial weight.

16 Plaintiff also contends that Dr. Platt's December 2004 assessment of
17 Plaintiff's RFC should be afforded substantial weight since Dr. Platt was Plaintiff's
18 treating orthopedic surgeon. However, this Court previously upheld the first ALJ's
19 rejection of Dr. Platt's December 2004 assessment, since it was conducted without
20 an examination and stated that Plaintiff was seriously disabled, sharply
21 contradicting the findings of his December 2003 examination of Plaintiff. Because
22 the December 2004 assessment was issued without an examination of Plaintiff and
23 upon Plaintiff's counsel's request, the ALJ determined that this assessment lacked
24 credibility. This Court found "no fault with the first ALJ's analysis in regards to
25 Dr. Platt's opinions" and affirmed "the ALJ's findings on the grounds that they
26 were supported by substantial evidence and clearly stated." (AR 420). For the
27 same reason, the ALJ cannot be faulted for preventing Plaintiff's counsel from
28 cross-examining the medical expert regarding Dr. Platt's December 2004

1 assessment.

2 Plaintiff also contends that the ALJ should have ordered an objective
3 consultative exam, as he stated he would at Plaintiff's November 8, 2007 remand
4 hearing. However, without any medical records after 2003, it would be impossible
5 to determine how the findings from a new consultative exam would bear on the
6 relevant period of claimed disability, starting in May of 2003. Thus, the ALJ was
7 correct in stating that "no longitudinal medical records or any treatment for several
8 years" supported his decision not to order a consultative examination.

9 The second ALJ properly assessed the medical evidence in the record since
10 his decision to deny Plaintiff's DIB claim was based on the examination of
11 Plaintiff's treating orthopedic surgeon, Dr. Platt, and the testimony of the medical
12 expert, Dr. Lyons. Additionally, Dr. Platt's December 2004 assessment of
13 Plaintiff, issued without an examination, was properly disregarded by the ALJ
14 since the District Court had previously held that this assessment was without merit.
15 Lastly, the lack of longitudinal medical records following Plaintiff's spinal fusion
16 supports the ALJ's decision not to order a consultative exam, since a new exam
17 would not reflect upon the claimed period of disability beginning nearly six years
18 prior. Thus, the ALJ's duty to make further factual findings was not triggered.

19
20 Issue 2: The ALJ improperly assessed Plaintiff's subjective complaints and
21 credibility.

22 To find a claimant not credible, the ALJ must rely on reasons unrelated to
23 the subjective testimony, on conflicts between his testimony and his own conduct,
24 or on internal contradiction in that testimony. Plaintiff contends that the second
25 ALJ discounted Plaintiff's credibility by relying upon a lack of objective evidence
26 in the record corroborating Plaintiff's pain allegations. Defendant argues,
27 however, that the ALJ properly relied on Plaintiff's unexplained failure to seek
28 treatment as evidence that Plaintiff's pain allegations were not credible.

1 It is always proper for an ALJ to consider the lack of medical evidence to
2 support a claimant's allegations. 20 C.F.R. §§404.1529(c)(1) & (2) (2008).
3 Additionally, the Commissioner may rely on Plaintiff's unexplained failure to seek
4 treatment as evidence that Plaintiff's pain allegations are not credible. Gallant v.
5 Heckler, 753 F.2d 1450, 1455 (9th Cir. 1984).

6 Plaintiff claims that he suffered severe pain during the six years following
7 his back surgeries in 2002 and 2003. Plaintiff had not sought treatment for his
8 alleged severe and ongoing pain since December 2003. In spite of his failure to
9 seek treatment, Plaintiff asserts that the objective medical evidence in the record
10 indicating that he underwent surgery in late 2002 and early 2003 supports his pain
11 allegations. The second ALJ based his finding that Plaintiff's pain allegations
12 lacked credibility solely on Dr. Platt and Dr. Lyons opinions' that Plaintiff was not
13 disabled and Plaintiff's failure to seek treatment for his pain. However, the second
14 ALJ never even heard plaintiff testify as to his pain symptoms. (A.R. 465-481). A
15 lack of objective findings may not provide the sole basis for discounting a
16 claimant's testimony, Morgan v. Apfel, 169 F.3d 595 (9th Cir. 1999). The second
17 ALJ's credibility assessment was premised solely upon a lack of objective medical
18 evidence. As such, the second ALJ may have been when he concluded that "it
19 seems entirely reasonable to assume that if the claimant were truly unable to work
20 due to his back problems and related pain, he would continue to seek treatment in
21 an attempt to ameliorate those problems. That he has not done so renders his
22 allegations fundamentally implausible." (AR 397). However, the second ALJ
23 never confronted the plaintiff with this assumption, nor give plaintiff an
24 opportunity to explain why he did not seek pain treatment.

25 Plaintiff also contends that the ALJ did not consider that Plaintiff failed to
26 seek treatment out of fear of treatment, as well as financial hardship. However,
27 Plaintiff never testified to these reasons at his hearing.
28

1 IV. ORDER

2 For the foregoing reasons, the decision is reversed and remanded pursuant to
3 Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. §405(g).

4 DATED: August 19, 2009

5 / s /
6 _____

7 STEPHEN J. HILLMAN
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28